

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

JEWEL GRIFFIN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:22-CV-533-ECM-KFP
)	
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

On May 4, 2023, the Court issued an Order requiring Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by May 18 and warning that a failure to comply would result in a recommendation of dismissal. *See* Doc. 5. Plaintiff’s copy of the Order was returned as undeliverable, and Plaintiff has had no communication with the Court since filing her Complaint in September 2022. This case cannot proceed if Plaintiff’s whereabouts are unknown. Thus, due to Plaintiff’s failure to update her address and failure to file an amended complaint, the undersigned concludes that Plaintiff is no longer interested in prosecuting this case.

The authority to impose sanctions for failure to prosecute or obey an order is longstanding and acknowledged by Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962); *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (stating that dismissal for failure to obey a court order is generally not an abuse of discretion where litigant has been forewarned). This authority empowers the courts “to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition

of cases.” *Id.* at 630–31; *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that “[t]he district court possesses the inherent power to police its docket.”). “The sanctions imposed [upon dilatory litigants] can range from a simple reprimand to an order dismissing the action with or without prejudice.” *Mingo*, 864 F.2d at 102.

Accordingly, the undersigned RECOMMENDS that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

Further, it is ORDERED that by **June 5, 2023**, the parties may file objections to this Recommendation. The parties must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made. Frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered by the Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) will bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waive the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District Court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except on grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *See* 11TH CIR. R. 3-1.

Done this 22nd day of May, 2023.

/s/ Kelly Fitzgerald Pate

KELLY FITZGERALD PATE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE